



238 South Wolfe Street
Baltimore, MD 21231
June 19, 2007

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

ATTN: Alicia M. Torres

Dear Ms. Torres,

Thank you for taking the time to speak with me regarding this application. I am submitting these papers in response to your Final Office Action, mailed on May 7, 2007, rejecting all claims of U.S. Patent Application No. 10/715,192. I hereby request continued examination of the application pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.114 (see enclosed Form PTO/SB/30), and have amended the specification and claims, amended one drawing, and added two new drawings with this submission. Enclosed are an introductory remarks section and a copy of the specification, claims as currently amended or previously presented, and drawings as in response to your last nonfinal Office Action. Two new dependent claims have been added. No new matter is contained in this response.

The requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 1.32(b) as promulgated in 37 C.F.R. § 1.114 are met by virtue of the fact that (a) prosecution of the application is closed by virtue of (b) the Final Office Action mailed on May 7, 2007. Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c), this submission includes new amendments to the written description, claims and drawings, as well as new arguments for patentability of the invention embodied in the application.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C § 112(d)

In the Final Office Action mailed on May 7, 2007, the examiner made a final rejection of all active claims based on 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶1. Since the only independent claim rejected is claim 18, and all other rejections of claims dependent on claim 18 flow from that rejection, only the rejection of claim 18 is addressed herein. Because the amendments to the claim and specification overcome the rejection of claim 18, all other rejections are overcome as a result.

It is the examiner's assertion that previously presented claim 18 contained subject matter that was not described in a way that would convey that the inventors had possession of the claimed invention to one reasonably skilled in the art when application was filed. The examiner correctly noted that claim 18 previously indicated that the grass guide contemplated therein be in a mounting position "above *and behind*" the lower ends of the blades, but that the drawings tended to suggest that the grass guide could be mounted forward of the blades, thereby rendering that language indefinite. The examiner